

Appl. No. 10/617,366  
Response dated July 14, 2006  
Office Action dated February 14, 2006

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have added claims 82-88, which are the same as claims 74, 75, and 77-81, but without mentioning container scanning equipment. It is respectfully submitted that all claims are allowable for the reasons set forth herein.

The drawings were objected to. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Applicants respectfully submit that those of ordinary skill in the art will know what container scanning equipment is and that the drawings adequately disclose this equipment.

Claims 74-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that those of ordinary skill in the art would understand what container scanning equipment is. Specifically, nowadays containers typically include bar codes on their sides. The container scanning equipment reads those bar codes. The container scanning equipment is placed near the causeway 604 so that the containers can be scanned to determine where they will be directed after they leave the causeway.

Claim 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Although claim 74 includes yard tractors in the claimed system, that does not necessarily mean that the method of claim 80 includes using those yard tractors as claimed in claim 81. Thus, claim 81 further limits claim 80.

Claim 74, 75, 80, and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weis, WO2004/085298, in view of Landow. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Weis is not available as a reference against the present patent application, as its date of publication (incorrectly listed on the PTO-892 as March 2003) is 7 October 2004, after the filing date of the present application. As this published application was not published in English, it is not available under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be used against the present patent application.

Claims 77-79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weis in view of Landow and Lovell. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, Weis is not available as a reference against the present patent application.

It is respectfully submitted that all claims in the application are allowable.

Appl. No. 10/617,366  
Response dated July 14, 2006  
Office Action dated February 14, 2006

Applicants respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants respectfully petition the Commissioner for any extension of time necessary to render this paper timely.

Please charge any fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0694.

Respectfully submitted,

/smn/

Seth M. Nehrbass, Reg. No. 31,28

e-mail: SethNehrbass@gsnn.us

Charles C. Garvey, Jr., Reg. No. 27,889

Gregory C. Smith, Reg. No. 29,441

Brett A. North, Reg. No. 42,040

**GARVEY, SMITH, NEHRBASS & NORTH, L.L.C.**

**PTO Customer No. 22920**

3838 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 3290

Metairie, LA 70002

Tel.: (504) 835-2000

Fax: 504-835-2070

P:\Seth2006\98246-1P-RES.2.wpd